DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 347 406 CE 061 806

AUTHOR Imel, Susan
TITLE Local Interagency Linkage Team Follow-Up Report. Ohio At-Risk Linkage Team Project.
INSTITUTION Ohio State Univ., Columbus. Center on Education and Training for Employment.
SPONS AGENCY Ohio State Dept. of Education, Columbus. Div. of Educational Services.
PUB DATE Aug 92
NOTE 32p.; For related documents, see ED 324 514 and CE 061 660.
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Adult Basic Education; *Agency Cooperation; *At Risk Persons; *Cooperative Planning; Employment Services; Human Services; *Linking Agents; State Programs; Team Training
IDENTIFIERS *Ohio

ABSTRACT

The Ohio At-Risk Linkage Team Project focused on strengthening state and local linkages of programs and services offered to at-risk persons. The state linkage team provided leadership for local-level interagency linkage development. In April 1990 and October 1991, two workshops trained 29 local linkage teams. The resulting action plans specified team membership, priority needs, target audience, purpose, objectives, evaluation criteria, products, and dissemination plan. Most team objectives related to providing or enhancing client services. Follow-up progress information was collected in three ways: a June 1991 meeting; a survey of workshop attendees, which received 23 responses; and anecdotal data from state team members. The workshops had a positive effect on the local interagency teams: 28 percent rated their team progress as excellent; 33 percent as very good, 22 percent as good, and 17 percent as fair. Lack of time was the most frequent deterrent to team progress. Sixty-seven percent of the respondents felt their success was due to linkage team assistance. Recommendations were made to hold training workshops for new teams, provide follow-up activities for existing teams, and match state team members as liaisons with local teams. (Two appendices list linkage team action plan objectives and tabulate follow-up survey responses.) (NLA)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED347406

LOCAL INTERAGENCY LINKAGE TEAM FOLLOW-UP REPORT

OHIO AT-RISK LINKAGE TEAM PROJECT

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Ohio Dept of Education

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CENTER ON EDUCATION AND TRAINING FOR EMPLOYMENT
THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY
1900 KENNY ROAD • COLUMBUS, OHIO 43210
Telephone (614) 292-4353 or (800) 848-4815

CE061806

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

LOCAL INTERAGENCY LINKAGE TEAM FOLLOW-UP REPORT

Ohio At-Risk Linkage Team Project

Prepared by Susan Imel

for
The Ohio Department of Education
Division of Educational Services

Center on Education and Training for Employment
The Ohio State University
1900 Kenny Road
Columbus, OH 43210-1090

August 1992

FUNDING INFORMATION

Project Title: Building Linkages for At-Risk Youth and Adults in Ohio

Source of Contract: Ohio Department of Education
Division of Educational Services
Columbus, Ohio 43266-0308

Contractor: Center on Education and Training for Employment
The Ohio State University
Columbus, Ohio 43210-1090

Executive Director: Ray D. Ryan

Disclaimer: Funds for producing and distributing this publication were provided by the Ohio Department of Education under authority of the Adult Education Act, P.L. 100-27 as amended. Opinions expressed do not necessarily reflect those of the Ohio Department of Education nor the U.S. Department of Education, and no endorsement should be inferred.

Discrimination Prohibited: Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 states: "No person in the United States shall, on the grounds of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving federal financial assistance." Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1971 states: "No person in the United States shall, on the basis of sex, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any education program or activity receiving federal financial assistance." The Building Linkages for At-Risk Youth and Adults in Ohio project, like every program or activity receiving financial assistance from the U.S. Department of Education, must be operated in compliance with these laws.

CONTENTS

FOREWORD v

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY vii

INTRODUCTION 1

THE BEST LAID PLANS 3

FOLLOW UP AND FOLLOW THROUGH 5

June 1991 Follow-Up Meeting 5

January 1992 Letter 6

1992 Follow-Up Survey 7

THE BOTTOM LINE 11

Conclusions 11

Recommendations 12

APPENDIX A: LINKAGE TEAM ACTION PLAN OBJECTIVES 13

APPENDIX B: RESPONSE TABULATION FOR INTERAGENCY LINKAGE TEAM FOLLOW-UP SURVEY 18

FOREWORD

Social, demographic, and economic changes during the past 30 years have reshaped families, communities, and schools. These transformations mean that families, communities, and schools must create new ways of supporting and nurturing education and lifelong learning. A positive result of the changes in society has been the recognition and acknowledgement of the interrelationships among the home, schools, and community as well as among public and private enterprises. However, the current system of delivering services has been structured within discrete categorical boundaries, usually related to professional disciplines and bureaucratic needs. This costly fragmentation within the service delivery system has created a call for collaboration among agencies and within communities to reach goals that cannot be achieved acting singly.

The project, Building Linkages for At-Risk Youth and Adults in Ohio, has addressed the need for interagency collaboration. During a 2-year period the project facilitated the development of 28 local linkage teams in conjunction with the Ohio At-Risk Linkage Team, a joint project of the Ohio Department of Education, the Ohio Department of Human Services, and the Ohio Bureau of Employment Services. This publication reports follow-up information on the activities of the teams since their formation.

Susan Imel, Project Director, developed the publication. Sandra Kerka, Program Associate, edited the manuscript, and Janet Ray served as word processor operator.

We are pleased to have been a part of the work of the Ohio At-Risk Linkage Team project and to have worked with our colleagues in the Ohio Departments of Education and Human Services and the Ohio Bureau of Employment Services.

Ray D. Ryan, Executive Director
Center on Education and Training
for Employment
The Ohio State University

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Ohio At-Risk Linkage Team Project focused on strengthening state and local linkages of programs and services offered to at-risk persons by the Ohio Department of Education's Division of Vocational and Career Education and Adult and Community Education Section, by JTP Ohio, and by the Ohio Department of Human Services's LEAP and JOBS programs. The state linkage team provided leadership for the development of interagency linkages at the local level.

In April 1990 and October 1991, the state team conducted two workshops that trained 29 local linkage teams and assisted them in formulating action plans for linkage development. The action plans specified team membership, priority needs, target audience, purpose, objectives, evaluation criteria, products, and dissemination plan. Analysis of the action plan objectives from both workshops showed that most team objectives related to providing or enhancing client services.

Follow-up information on the progress of local linkage teams was collected in the following ways: a June 1991 meeting for teams trained at the first workshop; a survey of attendees from both workshops, which received 23 responses (85 percent); and anecdotal data from state team members who provided technical assistance. This information indicated the following:

- The workshops had a positive effect on the development of local interagency linkage teams.
- Twenty-eight percent rated their team progress as excellent, 33 percent as very good, 22 percent as good, and 17 percent as fair.
- Lack of time was the most frequent deterrent to team progress.
- Sixty-seven percent of the respondents felt that accomplishments to assist at-risk clients would not have been possible without the linkage team.

Recommendations include holding training workshops for new teams, providing follow-up activities for existing teams, and matching state team members as liaisons with local teams.

INTRODUCTION

In the summer of 1989, spurred by the passage of the Family Support Act (FSA), Ohio formed a team at the state level to facilitate development of linkages between educators and human services staff at the local level. Originally composed of representatives from the Ohio Department of Human Services (ODHS) and the Ohio Department of Education (ODE), the state team has been expanded to include representation from Job Training Partnership Ohio (JTP Ohio), located within the Ohio Bureau of Employment Services (OBES). The primary focus of the At-Risk Linkage Team Project is on strengthening both the state and local linkages of programs and services offered by ODE's Division of Vocational and Career Education and Adult and Community Education Section, by JTP Ohio, and by the LEAP (Learning, Earning, and Parenting) program and JOBS (Job Opportunities and Basic Skills) training program, which are Ohio FSA programs conducted by ODHS. The team provides important leadership at the state level for the development of interagency linkages at the local level.

To encourage and facilitate local linkages of programs and services offered by vocational education, adult basic education, JTP Ohio, LEAP, and JOBS, the State At-Risk Linkage Team has planned and implemented two workshops to train local interagency linkage teams. A total of 29 local linkage teams from throughout Ohio were trained during these 2-day workshops held in April 1990 and October 1991. The workshops were designed to provide sufficient planning time for teams to draft an action plan for guiding their activities during the following 12 months. Technical assistance in the form of roundtables and state-level staff expertise was available to teams as well.

Teams attending the first workshop were required to have members representing the following areas: adult basic education, vocational education, and human services. The area of Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) was added to the required representation for the second workshop. Beyond these requirements, each team filled its roster according to local community needs and preexisting linkages. Some teams included representation from such groups as the Ohio Bureau of Employment Services (OBES), Urban League, postsecondary education, and family development centers.

Although evaluations of both 2-day workshops were overwhelmingly positive, the success of these programs can only be judged on the basis of subsequent team activities. Did the workshops serve as a catalyst for launching interagency teams? Were teams successful in following through on their action plans? Have they improved client services? In other words, did the workshops accomplish their goal of producing interagency linkage teams that worked?

This report provides data on the team activities that have transpired following the workshops. Most of the report is based on information collected in 1992 from a follow-up survey of teams. However, the report also contains information that was obtained at other points during the 30-month period since the first workshop. Because they provide a baseline from which to evaluate ensuing activities, the objectives from the teams' initial action plans are also included.

THE BEST LAID PLANS

A major portion of each workshop was set aside for the development of a team action plan, using an established format. The action plan form contained space for recording the following: information about team members; priority needs of area; sources of needs information; target audience definition; purpose/goal; objectives, including procedures, person(s) responsible, and anticipated completion date; evaluation criteria; products; and dissemination plan. At the end of the 2-day workshop, each team turned in a draft copy of its action plan, later mailing a final copy of the plan to the State Team.

The objectives in the action plans are the best available representation of team intentions. They have been coded and grouped according to categories based on the content of the objectives. Table 1 shows the results of this analysis, comparing the action plans from each of the two workshops.

Most of the team objectives from both workshops related to either providing or enhancing client services. Teams that attended the second workshop had more objectives that were concerned with developing and fostering linkages than did the teams that attended the first workshop. This difference might be explained as follows: perhaps the teams that attended the initial workshop were the early innovators or early adopters, and they came to the workshop in April 1990 with a firm commitment to linkages, whereas the teams attending the October 1991 workshop may have needed more time to work on the process of linkage development.

Appendix A contains the list of individual team action plan objectives that were used in developing table 1. The code assigned to each objective is included in parentheses following the objective.

TABLE 1
ACTION PLAN OBJECTIVES ANALYSIS

Responses coded into the following categories according to content of objective:	Oct. 1991 #	Oct. 1991 %	April 1990 #	April 1990 %
1. Client programs and services including	15	23	24	38
a. transportation	(4)	(6)	(3)	(5)
b. child care	(4)	(6)	(3)	(5)
c. other	(7)	(11)	(18)	(28)
2. Developing and fostering linkages	14	21	5	8
3. Information	8	12	6	10
a. for agencies	(6)	(9)	(6)	(10)
b. for clients	(2)	(3)		
4. Communication	4	6	7	11
5. Enhancing services to clients	16	24	15	24
6. Staff training/inservice	3	5	--	--
7. Funding	3	5	--	--
8. Other	3	5	6	10
TOTAL	66	101*	63	101*

*Total exceeds 100 percent due to rounding.

FOLLOW UP AND FOLLOW THROUGH

During their travels throughout Ohio, State At-Risk Linkage Team members collected anecdotal information about the progress of the linkage teams. These reports were generally favorable, indicating that teams were making headway in developing linkages and implementing their action plans. More formal information about the work of the teams was collected on three occasions: during a June 1991 follow-up meeting for the teams trained at the April 1990 workshop, as a result of a letter sent to these same teams, and from a 1992 follow-up survey sent to the teams that attended either of the workshops.

June 1991 Follow-Up Meeting

In June 1991, representatives of 8 of the 16 teams that had attended the April 1990 workshop participated in a 2-day follow-up meeting. The major purpose of the meeting was to provide teams an opportunity to update their action plans for the next year and to receive additional technical assistance in the form of roundtables and state-level staff expertise.

Team representatives gave oral reports on their accomplishments during the 15 months since the initial workshop, but no written record was made of this session. An end of the meeting evaluation indicated that 28 percent of the participants rated their team's progress in carrying out its first year's action plan as "excellent" whereas 33 percent rated it "very good," 22 percent thought it was "good," and 17 percent judged it as "fair."

The teams that attended this follow-up meeting were still active and interested in continuing their interagency linkage development. Several individuals expressed a need

to have team networking opportunities on a regular basis. Lack of time was the most frequently mentioned deterrent to the work of the linkage teams.

January 1992 Letter

In January 1992 a letter was sent to each team that attended the April 1990 workshop requesting a copy of its most recent action plan and a brief summary of its activities. The response to the letter was disappointing as only three teams replied formally. Examples of team activities collected as a result included the following:

- The development and implementation of a new long-term medical assistant program in which 12 of the 23 participants are human services clients.
- The expansion of in-home day care by providing additional training in order to meet increased need.
- The stimulation of the development and introduction of a bill in the Ohio Legislature calling for a change in age restrictions of current state school bus regulations. The team met with its local representatives to the Ohio Legislature and requested that the age limits be lowered to include infants of teens attending school and increased beyond age 22 to include adults who want to return to educational centers to study for their general equivalency diploma or receive additional job training.
- A survey of area service providers to gather feedback on common concerns related to client services, including lack of comprehensive assessment services, lack of consistent client referral process between agencies, and need for a ready reference brochure describing services provided by major service providers.

Information about team activities obtained through other means such as personal accounts included the following accomplishments:

- The development of a computerized common intake system used throughout the county by human services, adult basic and vocational education, and JTPA. Developed with funding from a number of grant sources, this system is eliminating the need for clients to complete intake forms at each agency.
- The creation of several county-wide advisory committees, including representatives such as county commissioners, state legislators, higher education personnel, and other community leaders. These advisory

committees have permitted teams to draw on community-wide expertise and influence community leaders in a positive fashion.

1992 Follow-Up Survey

By far the most complete picture of team activities and accomplishments was obtained from a follow-up survey sent to all the teams that attended either of the workshops. Late in May 1992, a questionnaire was sent to a total of 27 team leaders: 13 from the April 1990 workshop and 14 from the October 1991 workshop. By mid-August, a total of 23 or 85 percent of the questionnaires were completed and returned. Ten of the 13 teams (77 percent) from the April 1990 workshop and 13 of the 14 (93 percent) from the October 1991 workshop returned questionnaires.

Both the cover memo accompanying the questionnaire and the questionnaire itself encouraged inactive teams to respond, but only 2 of the 23 teams responding reported their status as "inactive." It is probable, however, that some of the nonresponding teams are also inactive. (Because of personal contacts, it is known that at least two of the nonresponding teams from the first workshop are still active.)

Appendix B contains a copy of the complete response tabulation for the follow-up survey. Some of the highlights are as follows:

- Most (67 percent) of the responding teams have 5 to 10 members with the most frequently represented areas being vocational education (100 percent), adult basic education (95 percent), JTPA, and JOBS (both 90 percent).

- When asked to rank aspects of the workshop, nine or 43 percent of the respondents ranked, "*Opportunity to become acquainted with team members*," first, followed by "*Block of time to develop a plan*," ranked first by seven or 33 percent.

- Nine or 43 percent of respondents said that their team would not have been established without the workshop, whereas eight or 38 percent said it would have. The balance, four (19 percent) were not sure. Most of those responding "yes" indicated that there was a linkage in place prior to the workshop.

- Most (38 percent) teams meet monthly, followed closely by quarterly (29 percent).
- Teams have used a variety of organizational strategies to help them function with the most frequent being information exchange (95 percent), followed by frequent communication and shared leadership function (each 81 percent).
- Most (48 percent) respondents characterized the nature of their linkage teams as both collaborative and cooperative. Thirty-seven percent indicated it was collaborative.
- Only 38 percent of the respondents indicated that they would like additional assistance from the State At-Risk Linkage Team.

In terms of this follow-up report, of most significance are the responses to the question, "What have been your team's major accomplishments?" A total of 55 items were listed in response to this open-ended question. For the purposes of comparison, these responses have been grouped into the same categories used for analyzing the action plan objectives. Table 2 is a comparison between the analysis of the items listed as accomplishments in the follow-up survey and the analysis of the action plan objectives. Although table 1 (p. 4) lists the objectives from the two workshops separately, in table 2. they have been combined. Also, several categories have been added to accommodate the type of accomplishments reported in the follow-up survey.

Care must be taken in interpreting these results. Thirteen of the 21 teams reporting accomplishments had only been functioning since October 1991 when they developed their initial action plan; the balance -- nine teams -- had been using an action plan to organize since April 1990. Also, no effort was made to correlate team objectives with reported accomplishments, that is, match action plans against individual team responses in the follow-up survey.

TABLE 2
COMPARISON OF REPORTED ACCOMPLISHMENTS WITH ACTION PLAN OBJECTIVES

Responses coded into the following categories according to content of accomplishment or objective:	List of Accomplishments from follow-up survey		Action Plan Objectives	
	#	%	#	%
1. Client programs and services	12	22	39	30
2. Developing and fostering linkages	11	20	19	15
3. Information gathering/sharing	3	5	14	11
4. Communication	10	18	11	9
5. Enhancing services to clients	9	16	31	24
6. Staff training/inservice	--	--	3	2
7. Funding	3	5	3	2
8. Other	--	--	9	7
9. Mechanics of team operation	4	7	--	--
10. Influencing policymakers/community decisionmakers	1	2	--	--
11. Product development	2	4	--	--
TOTAL	55	99*	129	100

*Total does not equal 100 percent due to rounding.

There are discrepancies between what was planned (objectives) and what was reported as accomplishments. Based on the information reported, the teams seem to be spending slightly more time on developing linkages and communication than planned. However, this difference could be accounted for by the age of the linkage teams. This undoubtedly also accounts for the category of accomplishments, "mechanics of team operation." Perhaps new teams are spending time establishing the ground rules for their ongoing relationships as a team. If this survey were to be repeated in a year, these differences might dissipate.

What was the role of the linkage team in these accomplishments? According to 67 percent of the respondents, they would have not been possible without the team. Only 11 percent responded without qualification that the accomplishments would have occurred without the linkage team.

The follow-up survey generated the most complete information on teams and their activities that had been gathered since the project's beginning. Still, like most surveys, it leaves many questions unanswered.

THE BOTTOM LINE

What conclusions can be drawn from the data collected during the course of the project? Did the workshops succeed in creating effective interagency linkage teams? The conclusions that follow address these and other questions. A series of recommendations related to the formation of interagency linkage teams at the local level completes the section.

Conclusions

There is evidence that the workshops were an important element in the life of the reporting teams. Although only 43 percent of the respondents said their team would not have been established without the workshop, many of those responding "not sure" or "yes" to this question acknowledged the role of the workshop in helping formalize existing relationships.

On the basis of reported information, it also appears that many of the teams' accomplishments are designed to assist at-risk clients and that these accomplishments would not have occurred without the team. A number of teams are engaged in activities that will either provide additional client services or enhance existing ones. What this information does not reveal is whether these accomplishments have actually resulted in improved client services. A different type of evaluation is needed to collect those data.

The information included in this report together with the anecdotal information collected over the course of the project provides evidence that--

- the workshops had a positive effect on the development of local interagency linkage teams throughout Ohio; and

- the teams are engaged in activities that are designed to improve services for at-risk clients.

Recommendations

Recommendations about interagency linkage teams and their activities include the following:

- Hold workshops to train additional teams. Feedback from team members at the conclusion of the workshops and in subsequent contacts has been very positive about the value of the workshops as a means of organizing the team.

- Provide additional follow-up activities for existing teams. Again, contacts with team members reinforce the need for continued state-level support for team activities. Not all teams may want or need this support but for many it will provide important reinforcement for continuing their work. Teams need opportunities to network and share successes and failures. They also need time to update their action plans.

- Match State At-Risk Linkage Team members as liaisons with existing teams. This connection could maintain state-level contact with teams and provide encouragement and support for their continuing work.

- Continue to document and share team accomplishments. Not only is this type of information important to provide impact data but also it can provide teams with ideas for improving their linkage work.

APPENDIX A

LINKAGE TEAM ACTION PLAN OBJECTIVES

ACTION PLAN OBJECTIVES--APRIL 1990 INSTITUTE

Team 1--Jefferson County

1. To instill an appreciation for learning early in life (1)*
2. To assist in overcoming barriers to high school graduation/equivalency (5)
3. To obtain high school diploma or equivalency (1)
4. To obtain postsecondary education/job skills train..g, if necessary (1)
5. To obtain specific job-related training (1)

Team 3--Eastland Vocational School District

1. To make available adequate child care (1)
2. To make transportation available (1)
3. To establish and maintain regular communication channels (4)
4. To provide education and training services based on client need (1)
5. To access human service system to provide financial public assistance and other special services for potential clients (5)

Team 4--Lawrence County JVS

1. To establish regular communication between Lawrence County Education systems and Lawrence County Department of Human Services and Lawrence County Community Action Organization (4)
2. To influence policy in Lawrence County Education systems, Lawrence county Department of Human Services, and Lawrence County Action Organizations (8)
3. To conduct a follow-up survey of GRADS and ABE participants in Project LEAP, JOBS, and JTPA (8)

Team 4--Auglaize County

1. To link with already existing social service meetings to educate each about individual agencies (2)
2. To develop an agency-wide referral system to eliminate frustration and confusion on part of client (5)
3. To develop a transportation system to enable clients to access programs available (1)

Team 6--Montgomery County

1. To increase staff awareness and identification of community services to enhance referral process (3a)
2. To increase community/consumer awareness and appropriate use of services (4)
3. To develop a common definition of job readiness (5)
4. To explore possibility of a central assessment center (5)
5. To establish linkage and/or contracts with service providers (2)
6. To establish procedures for effective and efficient reporting (8)

Team 7--Tri-County JVS

1. To identify the services each agency or educational institution provides to at-risk populations in our geographical area (3a)
2. To initiate more cooperation between the intake facility in making referrals of potential clients to other agencies and/or educational institutions (5)
3. To provide better access for participants to programs (5)

* Number assigned in coding responses

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Team 8--Warren County

1. Transportation (1)
2. Housing (1)
3. Child care (1)
4. Contracting LEAP (1)
5. Local coordination (2)
6. Job development (1)
7. Develop training programs for JOBS (1)

Team 10--Lorain County

1. To establish on-going communications among Lorain County Human Services, education and training providers, and other pertinent agencies (4)
2. To provide a marketing plan to assist Lorain County Human Services in implementing JOBS/LEAP programs (5)
3. To expand basic education opportunities for LEAP and JOBS clients (1)
4. To increase access to vocational/technical training for JOBS/LEAP clients (5)
5. To provide supportive services to JOBS/LEAP clients (1)

Team 11--Belmont County

1. To ensure productive cooperation between Belmont County Department of Human Services, Belmont Career Center, and JTPSO Belmont County (2)
2. To ensure that educational programs meet local employment opportunities (8)
3. To provide indepth client assessments including career counseling (1)
4. To provide client support services resulting in successful completion of training (1)
5. To develop job opportunities for job-ready clients (1)
6. To provide post-employment support to ensure job retention (1)
7. To stimulate local economic development (8)
8. To increase child care availability (1)

Team 13--Portage County

1. The coordinators will increase accessibility of programs to participants by June, 1991 (5)
2. The coordinators will expand and improve the networking of service providers by June, 1991 (2)
3. The coordinators will establish a system to identify at-risk participants by June, 1991 (3a)

Team 14--Licking County

1. To develop a common database (5)
2. To improve communications between schools, service providers, and potential employers (4)
3. To identify and provide appropriate services for clients by developing resources in the community (5)
4. To identify educational and training needs (3a)
5. To affect self-concept/attitude of clients (1)

Team 15--Adams County

1. Improve and expand ongoing regular communication between county service agencies (4)
2. Develop resource directory with referral procedure guide (5, 3a)
3. Present and inform local board of education and administration regarding needs for adult vocational education (8)
4. Provide job training services to adult clients (1)

Team 16--Hamilton County

1. To improve communication among cooperating agencies (4)
2. To identify clients who are eligible for and/or in need of supportive services to participate in educational and training programs (3a)

3. To develop improved procedures for collecting and processing data related to the maintenance of comprehensive client records (5)
4. To develop improved follow-up procedures (5)
5. To provide supportive services (1)

ACTION PLAN OBJECTIVES--OCTOBER 1991 INSTITUTE

Team 1--Hocking-Athens-Perry

1. Involve Perry County agencies in team (2)
2. Try to use the employment and training council meetings quarterly as a useful vehicle for the purpose of fulfilling the goals of our team (2)
3. Will defer to team meetings quarterly if not able to successfully implement #2 (2)
4. Develop career counseling type program for staff/availability of service to clients (6, 1)
5. Work toward having a Job Fair (1)

Team 2--Butler County

1. To identify existing county programs/agencies serving at-risk youth (2)
2. To establish regular communications between programs and agencies (4)
3. To identify the services already in place (3a)
4. To develop a more efficient identification and referral network process for at-risk youth (5)

Team 3--Buckeye JVS

1. To put in place effective linkages among community services (2)
2. To identify employment opportunities (3b)
3. To identify training needs and establish programs to meet them (3a, 1)
4. To identify and secure funding sources (7)
5. To increase public awareness through expanded marketing techniques (4)

Team 4--Ross County

1. Have client information generated at DHS/or PIC; passed through and forwarded (?) to other partners. (reduce duplication of paperwork, record keeping),i.e., print out Chris "e" and transport to PIC for streamlined intake (5)
2. Determine what information is necessary to be returned or provided to DHS, PIC, or Pickaway-Ross relative to client status--What and when? (8)
3. Establish unified case load strategy, i.e., our staff(s) to provide consistent case management to a fixed identifiable group of JOBS clients in employment and training activities. Beginning to end of ? process/ monitor, oversight, support and follow (5)
4. Establish and formalize ongoing process for evaluation, modifying and replanning, i.e., monthly meetings and agenda and determine frequency then on (2)
5. Identification of other partners with vested interests to include in formal structure and discussion, i.e. (OBES, Dept. of Eds, city/county) (2)
6. Examine and aggressively pursue additional funding resources, even through coalition type efforts (7)

Team 5--Ohio Hi-Point JVSD

1. Acquire knowledge of other agencies (3a)
2. Coordinate assessment/intake services (5)
3. Develop strategies for accessing clients (i.e. identify, reach, inform) (5)

Team 6--Mahoning County

1. Develop a formalized network for sharing ideas, concerns, and solutions (2)
2. Develop a uniform assessment to eliminate duplication of testing (5)
3. Define "Job Club," develop an appropriate program to meet the collective needs of all agencies (1)

4. Staff Development--"cross training" to facilitate communication between agencies (6)
5. Information for clients as to the services provided by the agencies and what is expected of the client in order to receive such services (3b)

Team 7--Clermont County

1. To work on system so that the system does not penalize clients seeking transition to self-sufficiency (5)
2. To make transportation a manageable problem (1)
3. To establish a better flow of information and marketing (4)
4. To make child care options more available (1)
5. To create a better referral system (5)

Team 8--Summit County

1. Establish an ongoing coordination team (2)
2. Develop a common referral process to expedite client services (5)
3. Develop a multi-agency inservice training program for participating agencies (6)

Team 9--Delaware JVS

1. To regularly communicate program goals, client referrals, projects, and grants/fund sources among area agencies in the Delaware County Linkage Team (2)
2. Delaware JVS will initiate paperwork to generate approval for PELL and OIG grant dissemination (5)
3. Collect information and investigate the implementation of a GOALS Program, effective for the 92-93 school year (3a, 1)
4. To investigate the availability of funds/grants and write proposals for grant monies that will expand the ABE and GED programs (7, 1)
5. To expand child care facilities and services in Delaware County (1)
6. To investigate and implement options which will expand transportation services to our target population (1)

Team 10--Fayette County

Team submitted only a summary with no objectives but with following goal:

> Our goal is to break dependency of Public Assistance recipients by overcoming barriers such as transportation, child care, defaulted student loans, housing and utilities. By doing this, we will need linkage between County Human Service, county educators, and local PIC 17 (1, 2)

Team 11--Scioto County

1. Meeting - Monthly (2)
2. Develop a retention program for GA clients (1)
3. Streamline information gathering procedures, forms, etc. (5)
4. Identify target population that is served by all agencies and improve case management for that client and family (5)
5. Form a plan for teen pregnancy prevention (1)

Team 12--Greene County

1. Identify services provided by other agencies within our area (3a)
2. Identify existing child care services available and proper referral process (1)
3. Search for possible solutions to county transportation problems (1)
4. Improve communication with other agencies (4)

Team 13--Gallia County DHS

1. Establish linkage team (2)
2. Develop need assessment (community needs) (3a)

3. Standardized assessment system (5)
4. Evaluate linkage team (8)

Team 14--Medina County

1. To determine a jointly agreed upon definition of "Job Ready" (5)
2. To determine sequential steps necessary to prepare client for job seeking according to our definition of "Job Ready" (5)
3. To institute a viable (simple, flexible, and timely) client tracking system, preferable computer linkage: a. grant writing sharing; b. continued adjusting/streamlining (5)
4. To network with other agencies/organizations that may be preparing clients for "job readiness" (2)
5. To evaluate preceding plan and develop new plan for the succeeding year in October (8)

APPENDIX B

RESPONSE TABULATION FOR INTERAGENCY LINKAGE TEAM FOLLOW-UP SURVEY

General Instructions. *Read each question carefully and indicate your response to each item with a checkmark. Please follow carefully the instructions provided with certain questions. Responses will be confidential. Individual teams will be not be identified with any of the report narrative covering the results of this survey.* ***IF YOUR TEAM IS INACTIVE, GO DIRECTLY TO PART IV ON PAGE 4.***

PART I. INFORMATION ABOUT THE TEAM

This section collects background information about your team and its location.

1. Which of the following best describes the area covered by your linkage team?

   7/39% a. Rural 3/17% b. Suburban 3/17% c. Urban

   5/28% d. Other (please describe)

   - All of above; Appalachian; combination of rural & urban; rural & suburban; suburban & urban

2. Which of the following agencies or areas are currently represented on your linkage team? (Check all that apply.)

   19/90% a. JOBS (DHS) 16/76% b. LEAP (DHS) 7/33% c. Other DHS areas

   20/95% d. Adult Basic Education 19/90% e. JTPA

   21/100% f. Vocational Education (list area, e.g., GRADS, Displaced Homemaker)

   - GRADS (9); Adult Voc Ed (7); Displaced Homemaker (4); Family Life (2); Transitions (2); GOALS; ONOW; Skill Transitions; Assessment/Testing; Secondary; Project Success

   5/24% g. Other (Please list)

   - OBES (3); Community college; Even Start; Community Literacy; At-Risk Educator; Clermont College; Family Development Center; Health Department; Early Childhood; Children's Services; Juvenile Court; School administrators and counselors; Truant Officer; Human Needs Planning Council

3. How many individuals are currently on your linkage team?

   1/5% a. less than 5 14/67% b. 5 to 10

   4/19% c. 11 to 15 2/10% d. More than 15

PART II. INFORMATION ABOUT THE INSTITUTE

This part of the questionnaire asks about the Institute sponsored by the State At-Risk Linkage Team.

4. Which of the following Institutes did your team attend?

   9/43% a. April 1990 12/57% b. October 1991

4a. If your team attended the April 1990 Institute, was it also represented at the June 1991 Follow-up Meeting?

   5 a. Yes 4 b. No

5. Please rate the following aspects of the Institute in terms of their importance to the subsequent work of your team. *Place a 1 by the item that was most important, a 2 by the item that was next, and so forth. If an item was not important to the work of the team, do not rate it.*

   2.2 a. Block of time to develop a plan (7 ranked 1)

   2.6 b. Format (i.e. Action Plan Form) for developing a plan (4 ranked 1)

   2.3 c. Opportunity to become acquainted with team members (9 = 1)

   3.3 d. Availability of technical assistance through roundtable discussions (1 = 1)

   4.1 e. Opportunity to talk with state-level staff (0 = 1)

   ____f. Other (please describe)

   - Initiative that drove the meeting (1 ranked 6)

6. Would your interagency linkage team have been established without the opportunity to attend the Institute?

   8/38% a.Yes 4/19% b. Not sure 9/43% c. No

6a. Why or why not?

   Those responding "Not Sure."

   - We would not have organized as quickly. Our agencies communicated prior to this but we did not address all issues. The Linkage team provided this opportunity to share and address known issues.
   - Some linkages had already been established.
   - Many of us have worked together in the past, but we may not have decided to form an active committee otherwise.

   Those responding "No."

   - We needed the time and the focus provided by the State Team members (no)
   - Our county was already coordinating efforts in many major areas. This team has initiated many more linkages and a more organized approach at dealing with specific problems.

- None of us would have considered setting aside a 2-day block of time to set up our plan.
- It provided the framework necessary for us to do the task.
- Time constraints

Those responding "Yes."

- Associations with agencies in linkage effort have been established for some time in our area.
- Our linkage was already very solid. However, the opportunity to obtain technical assistance was tremendous.
- To better serve our clients and to avoid duplication of services.
- But not as well organized.
- We have a loose association, however this gave us an opportunity to get away and work together without the daily interruptions.
- We were already meeting but not on as regular a basis.
- We had been working on several collaborative projects beforehand.

PART III. INFORMATION ABOUT YOUR TEAM'S ACTIVITIES

This section of the questionnaire asks about your team's activities.

7. How frequently does your team meet?

8/38% a. Monthly

6/29% b. Quarterly

2/10% c. Bi-Monthly

4/19% d. As needed

1/5% e. Other (please specify)

- At least quarterly but ABE representative and team coordinator meet monthly

8. What organizational strategies has your team used to help it function? (Check all that apply.)

17/81% a. Frequent communication

20/95% b. Information exchange

11/52% c. Established task forces or sub-committees

13/62% d. Updated action plan

17/81% e. Shared leadership function

3/14% f. Other (please describe)

- Communication, but not frequent
- Monthly lunches to share resources and information as well as working with each other to implement one another's program
- Had one-day workshop/retreat
- Collaborative efforts
- Addition of "missing" links in our chain

9. How would you characterize the nature of your linkage team?

8/37% a. Collaborative, i.e., establishes joint goals and objectives that could not be achieved by a single agency or organization

2/10% b. Cooperative, i.e., helping each other achieve individual agency or organization goals and objectives

_____c. Still stuck on "turf" issues

_____d. Other (please describe)

10/48% A & B
1/5% A & C

10. What have been your team's major accomplishments?

- Developed better lines of communication among agencies involved with Linkages Team
- Increased staff awareness of existing programs as well as identifying gaps in services
- Established work groups to assist in meeting our planned objectives
- Expanded Linkages Team to better address issues
- Involved other agencies to participate in the linkage effort bringing more ideas and resources to the table
- Getting to know each other and establishing lines of communication
- Essentially presenting the very real barriers that our at-risk populations encounter in the county when trying to reach educational centers to the influential leaders in education, human services, and politics.
- Meeting on a regular basis to share information, concerns and ideas. A recent consensus is that we are more productive when we are not constrained by too many goals and deadlines.
- Our county had a preexisting social service meeting, which meets monthly. We linked up with this organization; did presentations and acquired a greater amount of interest, as a result.
- Establishing joint goals and objectives that could not be achieved by a single agency or organization and helping each other achieve individual agency or organization goals and objectives
- JOBS Tuition agreement
- Linking funding
- Acquisition of seed monies for summer school and other educational purposes
- Submission of grant applications to expand and improve child care
- Job Club redesign
- ABE hours extended; more testing available with no decrease in passing rate
- Child care recruitment grant training
- Expansion of inhome day care

- Increase in short term training
- Transitions of homeless
- Stronger link with Head Start

- Establishment of common goals
- Communication
- Sharing and solving common problems
- Greater understanding of each other's programs and policies

- Obtained a grant to promote basic literacy in three county area. Grant was obtained as a result of having an established at-risk team.

- Community awareness

- Through a sharing of information and resources, the ABE was able to receive pass-through monies from DHS
- We have been able to develop plans for helping specific clients that our agencies shared
- We held a luncheon meeting for members, clients and other community agencies to identify other community needs
- We have plans to provide programs next fall for all our clients together
- We developed a community needs survey for all our clients

- Established ongoing team
- Streamlined billing, testing and referral system
- DHS provided outreach worker for sites
- Mechanism for ongoing problem solving

- Implemented a Clermont Area Literacy Linkage Project
- Established a Revolving Loan Fund wherein those seeking employment or education may tap into a low-interest loan. Also, as part of this project, established a car clearinghouse wherein, for an IRS deduction, citizens can donate their cars to be turned into cash for the loan fund or utilized as one of the cars to be sold.

- Linkage and referral process
- Identification of each organization's abilities, capabilities, and constraints has helped develop better strategies and solutions

- Development of common form for intake use
- Sharing of information about individual agencies
- Development of subgroups in each county

- Assessment tool used by all agencies
- Development of brochure which lists services and how to obtain them
- Tracking of people through system to determine what barriers exist between agencies
- Continued commitment by all agencies

- We have a new directory underway
- We have shared speakers
- Far better understanding of each other's work
- Joined forces with larger network -- added strength to it

- Improved communications between agencies
- Network -- gotten to know the people in the other agencies and what services they provide
- Increased number of team members
- Are cosponsoring a youth services fair in September
- Planning programs to highlight existing programs for youth in our county

11. In your judgment, would activities in 10 been accomplished without the linkage team?

- No, because of lack of time to plan
- No, stayed scattered in our approach rather than attempting unified activities
- No, inception at meetings
- No, turf issues, procedural difficulties between agencies
- No. We have found the sharing of information facilitated the work of the whole group as well as each agency.
- Perhaps, but not as fast
- Knowing one another will help break down interagency distance and ignorance of one another's missions
- No, it needed the coordination and framework this team provided
- No. We might have each worked with one or two agencies, but we would never have made these joint efforts.
- No. The collaboration did not exist prior to linkage institute.
- No
- Yes, but not to the extent we've been able to work together since regular meetings and collective goals.
- Part of them
- No. The team initiates a more collaborative approach.
- No, not as effectively. We like the "team" approach with an Action Plan to lead us.
- It would have been possible, and we would have achieved our linkage goal. It just made it so much easier.
- Agencies in our city are effectively managed. They meet goals, however, part of the services of each is based on interagency cooperation.
- No, the team brought together agencies and educators.
- We have a history of cooperation among agencies in _____ County, but not always collaborative.
- Because we already had established our Welfare Reform Committee, the above activities were not vital; but, the linkage workshop allowed us time to put parts and pieces together.

12. Please describe any brochures, pamphlets, or other materials that your team has developed?

- Our final goal is to develop a brochure about the different services in our community.
- Transportation booklet
- Current child care providers
- We developed a release form referred to [as] an interagency referral. The first agency which sees the participant has the client sign, enabling that agency to provide basic employment/educational information to the other agencies involved with this individual.
- Pamphlet describing the team and encouraging membership
- Child care in home booklet
- Monthly Roster of Services Delivered (Billing form)
- Referral Letter
- Provider-Initiated Referral Letter
- Provider-Initiated Termination Letter
- Brochure that lists services and how to obtain them
- Directory of Services (underway)

13. Would your team like additional assistance from the State At-Risk Linkage Team?

8/38% a. Yes 13/62% b. No

13a. If Yes, please describe the type of assistance desired.

- Group interested in looking at school attendance truancy issues and could use some assistance on how to approach.
- Perhaps a state official to meet once with team.
- Case studies explored
- Uniform definition of D. H. (displaced homemaker?)
- Not at this time (3)
- We are still continuously faced with fragmentation and lack of information and planning among state agencies which present local obstacles. Examples: no consistent contracting procedures; clash in JOBS travel policies; Pell offset issues; and assessment demo sites establishing. **Please** develop consistency of information and policy at state level. DHS JOBS, OBES/JTPA and Dept of Ed. Board of Regents. Competition for JOBS $ at state level leads to surprises locally of vocational schools and community colleges getting pass through funds or JOBS demo grants for assessment.
- From the Department of Development for Economic Development and Job Creation
- To support us as we approach DOL for a Skills Center as outlined in the Job Training 2000 Initiative.

- Financial assistance for a demonstration grant to develop a common computerized billing/attendance program to be used by all members/agencies of the linkage team.
- Further Institutes to share other teams' goals and accomplishments.
- Follow-up Conference to please explain what's available, i.e., computer programs, common application forms, etc.
- Funding for more networking
- Guidance in planning. Networking with other teams to see what they are doing. Information to let us know if we are on the right track.
- We are in the process of disbanding because we feel we have met our objectives in this county.

PART IV. INACTIVE LINKAGE TEAMS

If the linkage team that attended the Institute is inactive, please complete the following questions.

14. Please rate the following factors in terms of their importance in the team becoming inactive. *Place a 1 by the item that was the biggest factor, a 2 by the item that was next, and so forth.* ***If an item was not a factor, do not rate it.***

2 a. Lack of interest

1 b. Scheduling conflicts

___c. Turf issues

___d. Other linkage activities took precedence

___e. Other (please describe)
Accomplished goal (publishing a resource directory)

15. Approximately how long has the team been inactive?

2 months
1 year